



8-11-05

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10003357-1

\$ AF
2674
W

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): David D. Bohn

Confirmation No.: 6278

Application No.: 09/900,211

Examiner: J.T. Nguyen

Filing Date: July 6, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2674

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR INDICATING AN OPERATING MOE FOR A COMPUTER POINTING DEVICE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on June 10, 2005.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

() (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:

() one month	\$120.00
() two months	\$450.00
() three months	\$1020.00
() four months	\$1590.00

() The extension fee has already been filled in this application.

(X) (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account **08-2025** the sum of \$500.00. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

(X) I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Label No. EV 482713077US addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Date of Deposit: August 10, 2005

OR

() I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number _____ on _____

Number of pages:

Typed Name: Gail L. Miller

Signature: Gail L. Miller

Respectfully submitted,

David D. Bohn

By Jody C. Bishop

Jody C. Bishop

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 44,034

Date: August 10, 2005

Telephone No.: (214) 855-8007



Docket No.: 10003357-1
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
David D. Bohn

Application No.: 09/900,211

Confirmation No.: 6278

Filed: July 6, 2001

Art Unit: 2674

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR
INDICATING AN OPERATING MODE FOR A
COMPUTER POINTING DEVICE

Examiner: J.T. Nguyen

08/12/2005 SHASSEN1 00000002 082025 09900211

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

APPEAL BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

As required under § 41.37(a), this brief is filed within two months of the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on June 10, 2005, and is in furtherance of said Notice of Appeal.

The fees required under § 41.20(b)(2) are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and M.P.E.P. § 1206:

- | | |
|-------|---|
| I. | Real Party In Interest |
| II | Related Appeals and Interferences |
| III. | Status of Claims |
| IV. | Status of Amendments |
| V. | Summary of Claimed Subject Matter |
| VI. | Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal |
| VII. | Argument |
| VIII. | Claims |
| IX. | Evidence |
| X. | Related Proceedings |

Appendix A	Claims
Appendix B	Evidence (None)
Appendix C	Related Proceedings (None)

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is:

Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P., a Texas Limited Partnership, having its principal place of business in Houston, Texas.

II. RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 20 claims pending in application.

Current Status of Claims

1. Claims canceled: 5
2. Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: none
3. Claims pending: 1-4 and 6-21
4. Claims allowed: none
5. Claims rejected: 1-4, 6, and 8-21
6. Claims objected to: 7

Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1-4, 6 and 8-21.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Appellant did not file an Amendment After Final Rejection.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The following includes exemplary designations of places in the specification and drawings where support may be found for elements of the claimed invention, however, these designations are not intended to be an assertion that these are the only places where support may be found.

According to one claimed embodiment, a computer-pointing device (12 of Figure 1) comprises a first illumination apparatus (20 of Figure 1) operatively associated with the computer-pointing device, said first illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode (page 1, lines 17-25), the light generated by said first illumination apparatus providing for a user a visual indication of the standby mode of the computer-pointing device (page 3, lines 8-10, and page 4, lines 30-32), and a second illumination apparatus (26 of Figure 1) operatively associated with the computer-pointing device, said second illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in an input operating mode (page 8, lines 22-32), the light generated by said second illumination apparatus providing for the user a visual indication of the input operating mode of the computer-pointing device (page 3, lines 8-10, and page 4, lines 30-32).

Another claimed embodiment further comprises a switch, said switch allowing the user to disable the first illumination apparatus and the second illumination apparatus (page 12, lines 13-16).

According to another claimed embodiment, a method comprises providing a computer-pointing device with a first illumination apparatus and a second illumination apparatus (page 7, lines 24-26, and page 8, lines 22-24), determining whether the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode (62 of Figure 4, 166 of Figure 7, page 12, lines 17-23), illuminating said first illumination apparatus if it is determined that the computer-pointing device is in the standby mode (page 12, lines 21-23), the illumination of the first illumination apparatus providing for a user a visual indication of the standby mode of the computer-pointing device (page 3, lines 8-10, and page 4, lines 30-32), determining whether the

computer-pointing device is in an input operating mode (62 of Figure 4, 166 of Figure 7, page 12, lines 17-23), and illuminating said second illumination apparatus if it is determined that the computer-pointing device is in the input operating mode (page 12, lines 20-21), the illumination of the second illumination apparatus providing for the user a visual indication of the input operating mode of the computer-pointing device (page 3, lines 8-10, and page 4, lines 30-32).

According to another claimed embodiment, a computer-pointing device comprises means for providing for a user a first visual indication that the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode (e.g., 22 of Figure 1 and 52, 56, 58 of Figure 3, and page 9, lines 20-33, page 11, lines 3-7, and page 12, lines 17-23) and means for providing the user a second visual indication that the computer-pointing device is in input operating mode (e.g., 32 and 34 of Figure 1 and 52, 56, 58 of Figure 3, and page 9, lines 20-33, page 11, lines 3-7, and page 12, lines 17-23).

According to another claimed embodiment, a computer-pointing device, comprises a cursor movement control device (12 of Figure 1), said cursor movement control device allowing a user to move a cursor on display apparatus operatively associated with the computer-pointing device, a first illumination apparatus, said first illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode (20 of Figure 1 and page 12, lines 21-23), the light generated by said first illumination apparatus providing for a user a visual indication of the standby mode of the computer-pointing device (page 3, lines 8-10), and a second illumination apparatus, said second illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in an input operating mode (26 of Figure 1 and page 12, lines 20-21), the light generated by said second illumination apparatus providing for the user a visual indication of the input operating mode of the computer-pointing device (page 3, lines 8-10).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Claims 1-4, 6, 15-19, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,734,372 (hereinafter, *Verstockt*) in view of U.S. Patent 6,486,873 (hereinafter, *McDonough*).
2. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Verstockt* in view of *McDonough* in further view of U.S. Patent 3,938,138 (hereinafter, *Kojima*).
3. Claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Verstockt* in view of *McDonough* in further view of U.S. Patent 6,559,830 (hereinafter, *Hinckley*).
4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Verstockt* in view of *McDonough* in further view of U.S. Patent 6,650,322 (hereinafter, *Dai*).

VII. ARGUMENT

A. First Ground of Rejection

On pages 2-4, the Final Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6, 15-19, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Verstockt* in view of *McDonough*. Appellant traverses the rejection.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference itself or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the applied reference. *See In re Vaeck* 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck and Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Finally, the applied reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Without conceding the first and second criteria, Appellant asserts that the Examiner's rejection of these claims does not satisfy the third criterion.

In rejecting the claims in the application, the Examiner relies on *Verstockt* as a primary reference to teach or suggest most features. *Verstockt* teaches a system that monitors

a computer user's mouse use. *Verstockt* at Col. 2, lines 54-64. Once the mouse use exceeds a predetermined threshold, Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs) on the mouse alert the user to take a break, thereby preventing discomfort and fatigue of the user's hand. *Id.* at Col. 2, line 64 through Col. 3, line 5 and Col. 3, lines 14-33. Specifically, *Verstockt* teaches monitoring continuous operation of the mouse and alerting the user to the amount of use. See *Id.* Thus, the operation status that *Verstockt* teaches as indicated by the LEDS is one that depends on a cumulative distance the cursor is moved on a screen or on a cumulative time that the mouse has been in operation. See *Id.* Cumulative operation and movement does not constitute a "standby mode", as recited by the independent claims of the present application.

1. Claims 1-4, 6, and 15-17

Claim 1 recites, in part, "said first illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode." The cited combination does not teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 1 because neither *Verstockt* nor *McDonough* teaches a standby mode of a computer-pointing device.

First, *Verstockt* does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature. The Examiner cites Col. 3, lines 23-42 as teaching the feature; however, that assertion is incorrect. See Final Office Action at 2-3. The cited passage teaches that LEDs may be used for "noticing the operation status to the user." However, *Verstockt* does not teach or suggest that the operation status is a standby mode, or any other mode for that matter. The operation status that *Verstockt* teaches is one that depends on a cumulative distance the cursor is moved on a screen or on a cumulative time that the mouse has been in operation. See *Verstockt* at Col. 2, line 54 through Col. 3, line 5. This cumulative operation status is used to determine when it is appropriate for a user to take a rest. See *Verstockt* at Col. 3, lines 14-17. Cumulative operation and movement does not constitute a standby mode or any other mode. Thus, *Verstockt* does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of claim 1.

Second, *McDonough* also does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature because *McDonough* does not teach or suggest a standby mode of a computer-pointing device. At Col 2, line 64 through Col. 3, line 3, *McDonough* teaches:

According to yet another aspect of the present invention, a computer input device is provided which includes a housing configured to interface with a human hand, and an illumination device, which is coupled to the housing and is visible when the housing is placed on a supporting surface, where the illumination device indicates whether the computer is ON or OFF.

McDonough at Col. 2, line 64 through Col. 3, line 3.

Further, the Examiner cites Col. 7, lines 24-44 of *McDonough* as teaching different states of a computer-pointing device. See Final Office Action at 3. Without conceding that the Examiner's assertion is correct, it should be noted that *McDonough* does not teach or suggest a standby mode of a computer-pointing device. The cited passage from *McDonough* recites, in part, "In one arrangement, as shown in FIG. 6, the computer processing unit 310 may be coupled to a track-mouse control program 330 to control the 'state' or 'states' of one or more illumination devices 14 on the track-mouse device 10." *McDonough* at Col. 7, lines 24-27. However, this passage's reference to "states" refers to states of the illumination devices 14 (e.g., whether the illumination devices are ON or OFF), and does not refer to an indication of a mode of a computer pointing device (e.g., track-mouse device 10). Further, *McDonough* does not teach or suggest that any state of the illumination devices indicates a standby mode of its computer pointing device. Thus, *McDonough* fails to teach or suggest the above-identified element of claim 1 because it does not teach or suggest a standby mode of a computer-pointing device. Therefore, the cited combination of *Verstockt* and *McDonough* does not teach or suggest the above-recited element of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-4, 6, and 15-17 each depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and, thus, include all of the limitations of independent claim 1 in addition to their own supplied limitations. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all claim limitations of claims 2-4, 6, and 15-17. It is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-4, 6, and 15-17 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 1 for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6, and 15-17.

2. Claims 18 and 19

Claim 18 recites, in part, "illuminating said first illumination apparatus if it is determined that the computer-pointing device is in the standby mode." The cited

combination does not teach or suggest this feature of claim 18 at least because neither *Verstockt* nor *McDonough* teaches a standby mode of a computer-pointing device.

First, as explained above with regard to claim 1, *Verstockt* does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature. *Verstockt* teaches an operation status that depends on a cumulative distance the cursor is moved on a screen or on a cumulative time that the mouse has been in operation. See *Verstockt* at Col. 2, line 54 through Col. 3, line 5. Cumulative operation and movement does not constitute a standby mode. Thus, *Verstockt* does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of claim 18.

Second, *McDonough* also does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature because *McDonough* does not teach or suggest a standby mode of a computer-pointing device. The Examiner cites Col. 7, lines 24-44 of *McDonough* as teaching different states of a computer-pointing device. See Final Office Action at 3. However, as discussed above with claim 1, the reference to “states” in this relied upon portion of *McDonough* refers to states of the illumination devices 14 (e.g., whether the illumination devices are ON or OFF), and does not refer to an indication of a mode of a computer pointing device (e.g., track-mouse device 10). Further, *McDonough* does not teach or suggest that any state of the illumination devices indicates a standby mode of its computer pointing device. Thus, *McDonough* fails to teach or suggest the above-identified element of claim 18 because it does not teach or suggest a standby mode of a computer-pointing device. Therefore, the cited combination of *Verstockt* and *McDonough* does not teach or suggest the above-recited element of claim 18.

Dependent claim 19 depends from independent claim 18 and, thus, includes all of the limitations of independent claim 18 in addition to its own supplied limitations. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all claim limitations of claim 19. It is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 19 is allowable at least because of its dependence from claim 18 for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection of claims 18 and 19.

3. Claim 20

Claim 20 recites, in part, “means for providing for a user a first visual indication that the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode.” The cited combination does not teach or

suggest at least this feature of claim 20 because neither *Verstockt* nor *McDonough* teaches a standby mode of a computer-pointing device.

First, as explained above with regard to claim 1, *Verstockt* does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature. *Verstockt* teaches an operation status that depends on a cumulative distance the cursor is moved on a screen or on a cumulative time that the mouse has been in operation. See *Verstockt* at Col. 2, line 54 through Col. 3, line 5. Cumulative operation and movement does not constitute a standby mode. Thus, *Verstockt* does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of claim 20.

Second, *McDonough* also does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature because *McDonough* does not teach or suggest a standby mode of a computer-pointing device. The Examiner cites Col. 7, lines 24-44 of *McDonough* as teaching different states of a computer-pointing device. See Final Office Action at 3. However, as discussed above with claim 1, the reference to “states” in this relied upon portion of *McDonough* refers to states of the illumination devices 14 (e.g., whether the illumination devices are ON or OFF), and does not refer to an indication of a mode of a computer pointing device (e.g., track-mouse device 10). Further, *McDonough* does not teach or suggest that any state of the illumination devices indicates a standby mode of its computer pointing device. Thus, *McDonough* fails to teach or suggest the above-identified element of claim 20 because it does not teach or suggest a standby mode of a computer-pointing device. Therefore, the cited combination of *Verstockt* and *McDonough* does not teach or suggest the above-recited element of claim 20.

4. Claim 21

Claim 21 recites, in part, “said first illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode.” The cited combination does not teach or suggest at least this feature of claim 21 at least because neither *Verstockt* nor *McDonough* teaches a standby mode of a computer-pointing device.

First, as explained above with regard to claim 1, *Verstockt* does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature. *Verstockt* teaches an operation status that depends on a cumulative distance the cursor is moved on a screen or on a cumulative time that the mouse has been in operation. See *Verstockt* at Col. 2, line 54 through Col. 3, line 5. Cumulative

operation and movement does not constitute a standby mode. Thus, *Verstockt* does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of claim 21.

Second, *McDonough* also does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature because *McDonough* does not teach or suggest a standby mode of a computer-pointing device. The Examiner cites Col. 7, lines 24-44 of *McDonough* as teaching different states of a computer-pointing device. See Final Office Action at 3. However, as discussed above with claim 1, the reference to “states” in this relied upon portion of *McDonough* refers to states of the illumination devices 14 (e.g., whether the illumination devices are ON or OFF), and does not refer to an indication of a mode of a computer pointing device (e.g., track-mouse device 10). Further, *McDonough* does not teach or suggest that any state of the illumination devices indicates a standby mode of its computer pointing device. Thus, *McDonough* fails to teach or suggest the above-identified element of claim 21 because it does not teach or suggest a standby mode of a computer-pointing device. Therefore, the cited combination of *Verstockt* and *McDonough* does not teach or suggest the above-recited element of claim 21.

B. Second Ground of Rejection

At pages 4-5, the Final Office Action rejects claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Verstockt* in view of *McDonough* in further view of *Kojima*. Appellant traverses the rejection.

Claim 8 recites, in part, “said switch allowing the user to disable the first illumination apparatus and the second illumination apparatus.” The cited combination does not teach or suggest this feature of claim 8. The Examiner cites item 17 of Figure 2 and the passage at column 4, lines 14-17 of *Kojima* as teaching the feature. The cited item in *Kojima* is a time switching circuit that allows a calculator’s indicator (presumably, its screen), to be switched on an off periodically, thereby saving power through intermittent operation. See *Kojima* at Col. 3, line 63 through Col. 4, line 3. *Kojima* teaches that the time switching circuit is controlled by the control circuit, depicted as item 16 of Figure 2. *Id.* at Col. 4, line 7-10. Thus, *Kojima* does not teach or suggest that a user interacts with the time switching circuit, but rather, the control circuit controls the time switching circuit. Accordingly, operation of the time switching circuit of *Kojima* is by the control circuit, and it does not allow “the user to disable the first illumination apparatus and the second illumination apparatus.” The

Examiner does not rely on *Verstockt* or *McDonough* to teach or suggest the above-quoted feature. Therefore, the cited combination does not teach or suggest “said switch allowing the user to disable the first illumination apparatus and the second illumination apparatus,” as in claim 8.

Additionally, as shown above, a combination of *Verstockt* and *McDonough* does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Dependent claim 9 depends from independent claim 1 and, thus, includes all of the limitations of independent claim 1 in addition to its own supplied limitations. The Examiner does not rely on *Kojima* to cure the deficiency, nor does *Kojima* cure the deficiency. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all claim limitations of claim 9. It is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 9 is allowable at least because of its dependence from claim 1 for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection of claims 8 and 9.

C. Third Ground of Rejection

At pages 5-6, the Final Office Action rejects claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Verstockt* in view of *McDonough* in further view of *Hinckley*. Appellant traverses the rejection.

As shown above, a combination of *Verstockt* and *McDonough* does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Dependent claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 depend from independent claim 1 and, thus, include all of the limitations of independent claim 1 in addition to their own supplied limitations. The Examiner does not rely on *Hinckley* to cure the deficiency, nor does *Hinckley* cure the deficiency. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all claim limitations of claims 10, 11, 13, and 14. It is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 1 for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection of claims 10, 11, 13, and 14.

D. Fourth Ground of Rejection

At pages 6-7, the Final Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Verstockt* in view of *McDonough* in further view of *Dai*. Appellant traverses the rejection.

As shown above, a combination of *Verstockt* and *McDonough* does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Dependent claim 12 depends from independent claim 1 and, thus, includes all of the limitations of independent claim 1 in addition to its own supplied limitations. The Examiner does not rely on *Dai* to cure the deficiency, nor does *Dai* cure the deficiency. Thus, the cited combination does not teach or suggest all claim limitations of claim 12. It is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 12 is allowable at least because of its dependence from claim 1 for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the rejection of claim 12.

VIII. CLAIMS

A copy of the claims involved in the present appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A.

IX. EVIDENCE

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the examiner is being submitted.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS

No related proceedings are referenced in II. above, or copies of decisions in related proceedings are not provided.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Label No. EV482713077US in an envelope addressed to: M/S Appeal Brief, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313.

Date of Deposit: August 10, 2005

Typed Name: Gail L. Miller

Signature: 

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Jody C. Bishop
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,034
Date: August 10, 2005
Telephone No. (214) 855-8007

APPENDIX A

Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 09/900,211

1. A computer-pointing device, comprising:
a first illumination apparatus operatively associated with the computer-pointing device, said first illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode, the light generated by said first illumination apparatus providing for a user a visual indication of the standby mode of the computer-pointing device; and
a second illumination apparatus operatively associated with the computer-pointing device, said second illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in an input operating mode, the light generated by said second illumination apparatus providing for the user a visual indication of the input operating mode of the computer-pointing device.
2. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, wherein the computer-pointing device comprises a mouse.
3. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, wherein said first illumination apparatus comprises a light-emitting diode, and wherein said second illumination apparatus comprises a light-emitting diode.
4. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, wherein said first illumination apparatus generates light having at least one attribute different than the light generated by said second illumination apparatus.
5. (Canceled)
6. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, further comprising a third illumination apparatus operatively associated with the computer-pointing device, said third illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in another mode different from the standby mode and the input operating mode, the light generated by said third illumination apparatus providing for the user a visual indication of another mode of the computer-pointing device.

7. The computer-pointing device of claim 6, wherein said first illumination apparatus generates light when the computer-pointing device is not in contact with the user, wherein said second illumination apparatus generates light when the computer-pointing device is being moved, and wherein said third illumination apparatus generates light when the computer-pointing device is in contact with the user but the computer-pointing device is not being moved.

8. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, further comprising a switch, said switch allowing the user to disable the first illumination apparatus and the second illumination apparatus.

9. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, further comprising a time-delayed shut off switch, said time-delayed shut off switch causing the first illumination apparatus and the second illumination apparatus to be shut off after a period of inactivity.

10. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, further comprising a user detection device operatively associated with the computer-pointing device, said user detection device detecting when the user is accessing the computer-pointing device.

11. The computer-pointing device of claim 10, wherein said user detection device comprises an optical sensor.

12. The computer-pointing device of claim 10, wherein said user detection device comprises a thermal sensor.

13. The computer-pointing device of claim 10, wherein said user detection device comprises a mechanically activated switch.

14. The computer-pointing device of claim 10, wherein said user detection device comprises a capacitance proximity sensor.

15. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, wherein a data processing system is operatively associated with the computer-pointing device, said data processing system receiving a data signal from the computer-pointing device that is indicative of the operating mode of the computer-pointing device, said data processing system processing the data signal so that said first illumination apparatus generates light when the computer-pointing device is in the standby mode and so that said second illumination apparatus generates light when the computer-pointing device is in the input operating mode.

16. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, further comprising a control system, said control system actuating said first illumination apparatus when the computer-pointing device is in the standby mode, said control system actuating said second illumination apparatus when the computer-pointing device is in the input operating mode.

17. The computer-pointing device of claim 1, wherein said first illumination apparatus and said second illumination apparatus comprise a single illumination apparatus.

18. A method, comprising:
providing a computer-pointing device with a first illumination apparatus and a second illumination apparatus;
determining whether the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode;
illuminating said first illumination apparatus if it is determined that the computer-pointing device is in the standby mode, the illumination of the first illumination apparatus providing for a user a visual indication of the standby mode of the computer-pointing device;
determining whether the computer-pointing device is in an input operating mode; and
illuminating said second illumination apparatus if it is determined that the computer-pointing device is in the input operating mode, the illumination of the second illumination apparatus providing for the user a visual indication of the input operating mode of the computer-pointing device.

19. The method of claim 18, further comprising:

providing the computer-pointing device with a third illumination apparatus;
determining whether the computer-pointing device is in another mode that is different from the standby mode and the input operating mode; and
illuminating said third illumination apparatus if it is determined that the computer-pointing device is in the another mode, the illumination of the third illumination apparatus providing for the user a visual indication of another mode of the computer-pointing device.

20. A computer-pointing device, comprising:

means for providing for a user a first visual indication that the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode; and
means for providing the user a second visual indication that the computer-pointing device is in input operating mode.

21. A computer-pointing device, comprising:

a cursor movement control device, said cursor movement control device allowing a user to move a cursor on display apparatus operatively associated with the computer-pointing device;

a first illumination apparatus, said first illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in a standby mode, the light generated by said first illumination apparatus providing for a user a visual indication of the standby mode of the computer-pointing device; and

a second illumination apparatus, said second illumination apparatus generating light when the computer-pointing device is in an input operating mode, the light generated by said second illumination apparatus providing for the user a visual indication of the input operating mode of the computer-pointing device.

APPENDIX B

EVIDENCE

None.

APPENDIX C

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

None.